REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

In paragraph 5 of the office action, claims 1-5, 7-11, 13-17 21, 76-80, 82-86, 88-92, 95, 100-106, 106-110, 112-116, and 119 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 1039a) as being unpatentable over Gupta et al. U.S. Publication No 2002.0099777 a1 (hereinafter Gupta) in view of Henderson et al. U.S. Patent No. 6,185,603 B1 (hereinafter Henderson) further in view of Manber et al. U.S. Patent No, 6,651,086 B1 ((hereinafter Manber). The rejection is traversed and reconsideration is respectfully requested.

A discussion of Gupta and Manber has been made in the amendment of June 10, 2009. In Gupta, the collaborative email message is designed by the author (see paragraph [0055] lines 20-25 and [0056] lines 1-6). Independent claims 1, 8, 76, 83, 100 and 107 have been amended to make clear that the display of the message is under individual control of each computer system in the group of computer systems. This is supported at paragraph [0022] which states: "An objective of this system is to provide a form of event notification that is defined by one user and optionally controllable by the target user … ." and " … the target user is given control of the location of the notification on the display device, … ." Further, this is described at paragraph [0076] and shown at Fig. 28 which is a flowchart depicting receiving an unsolicited Alert message, and in Fig. 28, 2807 create custom interactive GUI and 2809 display custom interactive GUI. Claims 8, 83 and 107 have been amended to make clear that "the display of the message under individual control of the second computer system" and "such that the display of the message at the second computer system is determined by the user of the second computer system". It is submitted that the collaborative email messages are generated by the author (see [0054] – [0058]) and sent to each of the email servers associated with a recipient identified in the distribution list (see [0064]. In Gupta, the display of the collaborative email is not controlled as in the amended claims, but rather additions are made to the collaborative email without the email itself being altered. For instance, "adding comments to the message, forwarding the message, copying the message to a folder, deleting the message, etc" (see [0093]) and "The recipient is able to enter whatever types of comments he or she would like, including text, drawings, tables, other insertable objects (see [0088]). As claimed, these controls are determined by the recipient by extracting attributes and message functionality, examples of which are set out in paragraphs [0099] of the present application. Attributes are set out in paragraph [00100] of the application and functionalities are set out in paragraph [00101] of the present application. As set out in paragraph [00104] of the application, the application program at the user computer receiving the Alert message further comprises program code for preprocessing the message content before building the GUI according to the content of the message.

All independent claims claim subscribing to messages from a first computer. Gupta is an electronic mail message system in which mail is sent from a first computer to a second computer. In Gupta, there is no teaching or suggestion that the second computer systems subscribe to messages from the first computer. Manber discloses a system in which a user identifies or locates a story of topic by conducting a topic or keyword search and then joins a conversation by the conversation starter bringing the responding user into the conversation. In Manber, "The techniques of the present invention allow an individual who starts a conversation to maintain full control over who is able to join that conversation as well as how many are able to join at any one time " (see the abstract, lines 4-8). In the independent claims, a second computer system subscribes to messages from the first computer. The first computer does not invite the second computer system to join a conversation and does not know the identity of the second computer system. The message is went to all who subscribe to the channel over which the message is sent. The independent claims have been amended to claim that the display of the message is under the individual control of the second computer system. Further, in Manber, a user conducts a topic of keyword search to find topics on interest, whereas in the independent claims, the second computer system or individual computers in a group of computers independently search the message using keywords to see message of specific interest rather than seeking to join a conversation as in Manber.

If Gupta, Manber and Henderson were combined as suggested by the examiner, an email delivery system would result in which mail messages are addressed to users, and in which the users would search all mail and websites for topics on subjects which the user would like to join rather the claimed methods, systems and program products in which messages are sent to subscribing second computer systems, the second computer system filtering the message to see if it contained keywords of interest to the second computer system, and only displaying messages of specific interest to the second computer system and blocking all messages not containing the keywords, as claimed.

The independent claims 1, 8, 76, 83, 100 and 107 have been amended to include filtering of claims 6, 12, 81, 87, 105 and 111 respectively. Claims 6, 12, 81, 87, 105 and 111 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gupta, Henderson and Manber, and further in view of U.S. Publication No. 2003/0023692 A1 by Moroo (hereinafter Moroo), and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,152,094 B1 to Jannu et al. (hereinafter Jannu). The rejection is respectfully traversed and reconsideration is requested. The art cited in the rejection of 3/11/08 was to receiving a message by way of a pub/sub service. Since the claims as previously amended are directed to filtering, it is submitted that the art submitted by the examiner on 3/11/08 is not pertinent to claims 1, 8, 76, 83, 100 and 107 as amended herein.

In Moroo, the sender of the emails are scanned for permitted senders, and the mail is either sent to the unwanted-mail mailbox 25 or stored in the permitted sender's mailbox (see paragraphs [0032]-[0042]). Even if the mail is in the unwanted-mail mailbox, the user is able to browse the mail messages (see paragraph [0034] lines 9-11). In the independent claims, the messages not containing the keywords are blocked by the filters and not seen by the second computer system or the computer system in the group of computer systems.

Jannu discloses a middleware brokering system adapter in which messages are published to subscribers by a publish/subscribe engine. The subscribers register with the publish/subscribe engine about what types of message subject matter they are interested in. The publish/subscribe engine matches the content data from the publishers with the registration data from the subscribers and sends the message to the appropriate subscribers. (See column 2, lines 17-22). In Jannu, filterable body 432 of the structured event is matched as described in column 10, lines 39-59, and then the message brokering service 360 and the publish/subscribe engine 370 then act together as a message broker and match the published message with interested subscribers (column 10, line 55-58). However, in the independent claims, each second computer system or computer system in the group of computers independent filter the message such that the message would have to contain the keywords of interest to that computer before the respective computer sees the message, and messages not containing the keywords are blocked by the filter from being seen by the respective computer system. Thus, it is claimed that the individual second computers filter the message for messages of interest rather than the publisher of the message filtering the messages. Further, the independent claims claim blocking those message not containing the keywords rather than placing them in memory to be examined later.

It is submitted that the independent claims 1, 8, 76, 83, 100 and 107, and all claims depended therefrom, are allowable over Gupta in view of Henderson and further in view of Manber, and allowable over Gupta, Henderson and Manber further in view of Moroo, art cited in the office action mailed on 3/11/08, and further in view of Jannu, which allowance is respectfully requested.

The examiner's attention is directed to US Patent No. 6,587,668 to Miller et al. (hereinafter Miller) which has been cited in related applications. The examiner's arguments in those applications are included in the IDS filed herewith. Miller discloses an enterprise wide integrated training system. Miller discloses an administration functionality which dynamically and individually limits courses to a subset of the total population (see column 2, lines 36-39). Further the system of Miller enables automatic filtering of on-line training content based on corporate preference (see column 2, lines 51-55). This is different than the filtering claimed in claims 32, 33 and 34 wherein the filtering is done by the second user who filters the messages sent to all of the subscribers of a channel having a topic of interest. The filtering allows only questions of topics of specific interest to be received by the second user. Further, in Miller, in some embodiments, questions posted are automatically routed to an employee designated as an expert. The expert may be known or unknown by the user posting the question. Expert status may be attained by self designation or successful completion of an assessment as discussed (see column 6, lines 6-11). Thus in Miller, all of the questions from a user are submitted to an expert, whereas in the claims, the questions received by the second user is determined by the filters set by the second user, and those questions which are not allowed by the filter are blocked. Further in Miller, the knowledge band web page also provides an "ask the expert" page that allows users to direct questions to other users designated as departmental experts. In one embodiment, such questions are sent directly and automatically to the designated experts and may not identify the experts. In another embodiment, the user may select from the available experts which may be identified and rated possibly based on the on-line assessments discussed (see column 7, lines 35-43). It is submitted that in Miller, the user determines what is sent to the expert and that all questions sent to the expert are received without further filtering. In the claims, the second user filters the questions such that the second user only receives those messages that are allowed by the filter, and that all other questions are blocked. It is submitted that the independent claims, and all claims depended therefrom, are allowable over Miller, which allowance is respectfully requested.

It is respectfully submitted that the application is now in condition for allowance, which allowance is respectfully requested.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED

/Floyd A. Gonzalez/

BY: FLOYD A. GONZALEZ-Attorney
Registration No. 26,732
Phone: 845-433-7282
Fax: 845-432-9601